

TENNESSEE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
FISCAL REVIEW COMMITTEE



FISCAL NOTE

HB 418 - SB 1050

February 23, 2013

SUMMARY OF BILL: Requires all courts, if choosing to operate an electronic court filing system, to use the same system provider. The system provider shall be determined by the Administrative Office of the Courts.

ESTIMATED FISCAL IMPACT:

Other Fiscal Impact – Currently, only one county in Tennessee has implemented an electronic court filing system. Any county that chooses to implement such a system in the future will incur costs, but those costs depend upon several unknown factors, including which system provider is chosen by the Administrative Office of the Courts and whether the county currently has a case management system. Any permissible costs, however, are reasonably estimated to exceed \$750,000 per county.

Assumptions:

- The bill does not require courts to implement such a system. Rather, it restricts which system provider the courts may use when implementing such a system.
- Currently, only one county in Tennessee has implemented an electronic court filing system.
- The county had a case management system from ACS/Xerox before purchasing electronic filing (e-filing) software from Tybera Development Group, Inc., a partner of ACS. The software is called eFlex. The county did not provide Fiscal Review with information on the cost of implementing their e-filing system.
- However, Arkansas recently implemented the same e-filing system. Pulaski County, Arkansas also had an existing ACS Case Management system, and only required the licensing, integration, implementation, and support of Tybera's software. Arkansas entered into a two-year contract with Tybera for \$1.5 million.
- The breakdown of Arkansas' two-year contract is as follows:
 - Licensing: \$725,550;
 - Integration: \$183,750;
 - Implementation: \$449,625; and
 - Support/Monitoring: \$168,110.
- It is reasonable to assume that the Tennessee county's cost to implement its e-filing system was comparable to Pulaski County, Arkansas's costs. The cost to other Tennessee counties will depend on whether or not they currently have a case

management system or not. If they do, then the cost will depend upon whether or not the system provider the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) chooses can easily configure its software with the county's case management system.

- If counties do not have case management systems and choose to implement a system, then the cost will be significant, as the county will have to contract for a case management system, document managing system, and e-filing software.
- E-filing systems can be implemented statewide, but the costs vary. South Dakota implemented a statewide system for approximately \$6 million. Oregon contracted to implement a statewide system for \$31 million.
- According to the AOC, the bill would not result in a significant impact on the courts. The AOC would merely need to develop relationships with various system providers and select the provider counties must use when implementing and maintaining an e-filing system.

CERTIFICATION:

The information contained herein is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lucian D. Geise".

Lucian D. Geise, Executive Director

/trm